

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
EASTERN DIVISION

ESTATE OF BRENT RENARD)	
RICHARDSON, JR., by Next of Kin)	
PATRICE RICHARDSON)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	No. 1:24-cv-01128-STA-jay
v.)	
)	
CORECIVIC, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS TO DISMISS AS MOOT

Defendants have filed two motions to dismiss. (ECF Nos. 15, 16.) Plaintiff has responded to the motions (ECF Nos. 20, 21) and has also an amended complaint. (ECF No. 19.) In light of the filing of the amended complaint, Defendants' motions to dismiss are **DENIED** as moot. *See Parry v. Mohawk Motors of Mich., Inc.*, 236 F.3d 299, 306 (6th Cir. 2000) (holding that the amended complaint supersedes all previous complaints and becomes the operative pleading)); *see also Glass v. The Kellogg Co.*, 252 F.R.D. 367, 368 (W.D. Mich. 2008) (“Because the original complaint has been superseded and nullified, there is no longer a live dispute about the propriety or merit of the claims asserted therein; therefore, any motion to dismiss such claims is moot.”)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ S. Thomas Anderson
S. THOMAS ANDERSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: November 27, 2024